DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 997 CG 007 720

AUTHOR Eby, Maureen A.
TITLE Socioeconomic-Ethnic Status Inconsistency Vis-A-Vis Students' Potential for Mobilization. An Examination of Status Relationships.
PUB DATE Aug 72
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana, August 28-31, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; *College Students; Ethnic Status; Research Projects; Social Attitudes; Socioeconomic Ba ground; *Socioeconomic Status; *Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

In an attempt to further analyse the status backgrounds of participants in the student movement by utilizing the concept socioeconomic-ethnic status inconsistency as it is used in the studies of voting behavior, it was discovered that the more actively mobilized students were recruited from low ascribed/high achieved status backgrounds while the more passive or politically apathetic students were recruited from exactly the opposite--the high ascribed/low achieved status backgrounds. This dispels the assertion of recent studies that due to the rapid growth and expansion of the student movement that the student's status background is no longer an adequate indicator of movement participation. (Author)

SOCIOECONOMIC-ETHNIC STATUS INCONSISTENCY VIS-A-VIS STUDENTS' POTENTIAL FOR MOBILIZATION

AN EXAMINATION OF STATUS RELATIONSHIPS

Maureen A. Eby
Bureau of Governmental Research
University of Maryland

Paper to be presented at the
67th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association
New Orleans, Louisiana, August 28-31, 1972.

The student movement[1] has attracted quite a lot of sociological and psychological interpretations within the last decade. Next to the civil rights movement it is one of the few that has been carefully analysed throughout its growth. Research into the student movement took the form of behavioral and empirical studies purporting reasons as to why students were reacting to society in such a manner. These studies developed and empirically supported a variety of hypotheses each one of them claiming to be of significance in analyzing this phenomenon. Until recently one of the more popular predictors of participation in the movement was the social or status backgrounds of its participants. Typically they were characterized as "the sons and daughters of high income families, in which both parents have at least four years of college and tend to be employed in occupations for which advanced educational attainment is a primary requisite." (Flacks, 1970: 137) However, basing their assumption on the rapid growth and expansion of the movement, recently several studies have concluded that the student's status background is no longer an adequate indicator of movement participation. (Dunlap, 1970; Kahn and Bowers, 1970; Eby, 1971; Mankoff and Flacks, 1971; and Tygart and Holt, 1971) Basically these studies showed in bivariate analyses that status background was not statistically correlated to movement participation or activist tendencies. In fact, no appreciable type of status background could be discerned. All of this pointing to the apparent truth of

the statement that:

> "As the movement spreads, becomes more visible and increasingly focuses on issues affecting the immediate self-interests of students, we can expect that a much wider variety of students will be drawn to it, and that family background and tradition will become a less and less powerful predictor of who is an activist."
> (Derber and Flacks, 1967: 72)

Even more recently, Lipset (1971: 83) concluded that the status background of participants in the student movement will have significantly weakened because recruits are drawn more and more from the less well-to-do, the less politicized and the more diverse religious family backgrounds.

But is this really the case? There can be no doubt as to the growth of the student movement as evidenced in the results of a study conducted by Kruschke (1971: 6-7). Between 1966 and 1970 there was a marked increase in the number of students reporting participation in activities expressing disapproval of governmental policies. For example in 1965, 47.5% of the students had signed a petition of one sort or another while in 1970 it had increased to 69.7%. In 1966, 26.5% had attended a protest meeting but in 1970 this had almost doubled to 51.2%. This increase was even evident in acts of violence and civil disobedience. In 1966 only half a percent had indicated participation in a violent demonstration but in 1970 this had risen to three times that amount (1.5%).[2]

Yet, does this apparent growth in the student movement rule out the possibility that the student's status background is still an adequate indicator of movement participation? Could it not be possible that there are certain status types or configurations that are being systematically

recruited or drawn into the movement though not in formal organizational ways? It is the purpose of this paper to attempt to answer these questions by applying the assumptions used in the studies of voting behavior. In using the concept socioeconomic-ethnic status inconsistency, it will be shown that there definitely is a relationship between the status background of student participants and their level of mobilization within the movement.

SOCIOECONOMIC-ETHNIC STATUS INCONSISTENCY ITS ROLE IN DETERMINING POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

The role of status inconsistency in voting behavior studies has developed only within the last fifteen years,[3] but in that time it has become one of the most widely used indicators of voting preference and political participation. Defined, status inconsistency is the degree to which an individual's rank positions on important societal status hierarchies are at a comparable level. When a person holds high rank on one status dimension and low rank on another, the expectations mobilized by the rank positions will often be in conflict. (Jackson, 1962: 469-470)

The first real empirical evidence of the effect of status inconsistency came with Gerhard Lenski's now classical study "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status" (1954: 405) where he hypothesized:

> ". . . individuals characterized by a low degree of status crystallization differ significantly in their political attitudes and behavior from individuals characterized by a high degree of status crystallization when status differences in the vertical dimensions are controlled."

Since then, status inconsistency has been utilized in attempts to account for patterns of participation in voluntary associations (Lenski, 1956); variance in psychosomatic symptom levels (Jackson, 1962); choices of religious styles (Demarath, 1965); and sucide rates (Gibbs and Martin, 1958) among other phenomenon. (Treiman, 1966: 551)

In its earlier beginnings, status inconsistency was faced with many problems. There were contradictory findings and usually replication of studies did not include the same set of variables. Consequently, any significant findings were lost in the ensuing controversy over the measurement of status inconsistency. However, with the realization of the importance of ethnicity in relation to political party preference (Brandmeyer, 1965; Kelly and Chambliss, 1966; Lenski, 1954, 1967; Mitchell, 1964; and Treiman, 1966) a new dimension was added to these studies. It was found that certain types of status relationships, always including some measure of race, religion or ethnicity, predisposed individuals towards either the Democratic or Republican party. (Broom and Jones, 1970; Laumann and Segal, 1971; Segal, 1969, 1970; Segal and Knoke, 1968, 1969, 1971; Olsen and Tully, 1970, 1971; Jackson, 1962; and Smith, 1969) In other words - - -

> ". . . members of minority religious and ethnic groups and persons of low occupational, financial or educational status, tend to support the Democratic party, while members of the Protestant churches, and persons of high status, generally tend to support the Republican party."
> (Segal, 1969: 352)

Thus, inconsistency between an achieved and an ascribed status was more likely to lead to Democratic party preference than was inconsistency

between two achieved statuses or two ascribed statuses.[4] (Segal and Knoke, 1963: 154)

More recently, Olsen and Tully (1970, 1971) have isolated these two types of status inconsistents - the high ascribed/low achieved and the low ascribed/high achieved individuals - as having the strongest determining effect on political behavior. These two types of individuals now are providing the basis for further research into their correlates with voting behavior, and it could conceivably be possible that either of these two types of status inconsistents might be found participating in the student movement.

The High Ascribed/Low Achieved Status Inconsistent

This individual's achieved ranks (occupation, education, and income) are inferior to his ascribed ranks (ethnicity, race and religion), and more often than not he usually views his situation as personal failure. Unlike his counterpart he cannot rationalize his position in terms of ascribed handicaps, therefore his difficulties stimulate feelings of personal deficiencies and self-blame. (Jackson, 1962: 477) He usually seeks personal means of altering this situation either by taking more educational courses or technical skills to acquire a better occupation and thereby increasing his achieved status.

This type of individual usually has an extremely low tolerance to protest actions as a means of social change. In fact these individuals usually withdraw from the political arena. (Segal, 1969; Segal and Knoke, 1969; and Olsen and Tully, 1970: 28) As Olsen and Tully (1970: 28)

explain - - -

> ". . . as long as this form of low status is seen by many people as open to change through individual social mobility, this belief will blunt most pressures for broad-scale structural change through political action."

The Low Ascribed/High Achieved Status Inconsistent

However, there is quite a different situation existing with this individual. In this case his ascribed statuses are inferior to his achieved statuses. He has risen usually just as high as social mobility will allow him, and he personally regards himself as a success since he has won or maintained this position despite the handicaps of low racial-ethnic status. If he experiences stress due to conflicting status expectations, then he is less likely to blame himself than to see his problem as stemming from the unjust actions of others. He is, therefore, likely to express this politically hence the strong inclination to favor social change. (Jackson, 1962: 477)

The High Ascribed/High Achieved and Low Ascribed/Low Achieved Status Consisten

These individuals are considered to be status consistent because their achieved statuses are in alignment with their ascribed statuses. There is no apparent discrepancy felt by the individual, consequently in his political behavior the influences of status, class and ethnic considerations are usually subverted by the others eg. issues, candidate appeal, political perceptions, etc.

In support of these two profiles Olsen and Tully's (1970: 23) findings show that 51% of the low ascribed/high achieved inconsistents favored social protest actions as opposed to only 29% of the high ascribed/

low achieved inconsistents. The other two consistent categories (high/high and low/low) had relatively average scores on this variable.

As previously mentioned it could be suggested that these same trends might be found within the student movement. As earlier noted, studies on the status backgrounds of student activism were usually not consistent in their findings. As is the case with these more recent studies (Dunlap, 1970; Kahn and Bowers, 1970, Eby, 1971; Mankoff and Flacks, 1971; and Tygart and Holt, 1971) a measure of ascribed status (with the exception of Mankoff and Flacks, 1971 and Eby, 1971) was not used in the analyses. This could have accounted for the negative results. Furthermore, the inadequacies of simple bivariate analyses have been demonstrated in voting studies. One needs to view the interactive effects of these status relationships, hence a multidimensional approach or multivariate analysis should be employed. (Jackson, 1962; Olsen and Tully, 1970; Eby, 1971; and Mitchell, 1964) This has yet to be done in any study of the status backgrounds of participants in the student movement.

Two of these recent studies, however, seem suggestive towards this type of research. The Mankoff and Flack's (1971: 59) study included a measure of ascribed status - religion - though they did not include this in their analysis.[5] In one of their tables it can be seen that 65.4% of their veteran cadre (students who have been actively engaged in protest actions for three or more years) originated in families of Jewish or non-religious backgrounds, while only 39.4% of the non-veteran cadre (those engaged in protest activities less than three years) and 18.3%

of their cross-sectional sample belonged to this type of religious background. With regards to educational attainment of the father (the only achieved status used) the veteran cadre had 65.1% whose fathers had achieved a high level of attainment while 54.2% of the non-veteran cadre and 42.5% of the cross-sectional sample had fathers at this level. These results certainly seem to show that a large proportion of their veteran cadre ("student activists") are recruited from homes with status backgrounds falling into the low ascribed/high achieved status category.

Finally, in a study conducted by this author (Eby, 1971: 8-12) last year, it was noted that hyperactive students (those students having high levels of mobilization - participation in civil disobedience, etc.) had fathers who came predominantly from Eastern and Southern Europe (54%); who had obtained a B.A. or higher (53%); earned over $20,000 (39%); and whose occupation was in the medium and major range of professional (64%). However, the passive students (those who had signed petitions, written letters, etc.) had fathers who came from Anglo-Saxon and Northern European decendents (82%); had a high school diploma or less (47%); earned under $20,000 (89%); and whose occupations ranged from clerical to skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers. This, too, seems to suggest that the more actively mobilized students are recruited from low ascribed/high achieved backgrounds, and conversely passive students or the more politically apathetic ones are recruited from high ascribed/low achieved status backgrounds.

In light of these studies, it seems quite plausible that these two types of status relationships will manifest themselves in the student

movement. However, first of all three assumptions which Olsen and Tully (1971: 6-8) have suggested must be put forth. These are social-psychological conditions which must intervene between the inconsistent and his political behavior: 1) The individual must perceive himself as holding two or more sharply discrepant statuses; 2) the individual occupying perceived inconsistent statuses must want to alter the situation in some way so as to escape from this inconsistency; and 3) the individual seeking to escape from perceived status inconsistency must see broad-scale social/political change as the only or best means of achieving this goal (or on the otherhand see in himself the ability to alter this situation). Therefore, based on these assumptions and using the Olsen and Tully (1970, 1971) typology in terms of students' behavior or participation in the student movement, it is hypothesized that: (See Figure I)

H_1 The more actively mobilized students will be drawn from the low ascribed/high achieved status backgrounds; while conversely

H_2 The more passive or politically apathetic students will be drawn from the high ascribed/low achieved status backgrounds; and finally

H_3 The status consistent (high/high and low/low) individuals will tend to be found within all levels of mobilization in the student movement.

METHODOLOGY

As already described the status inconsistency model used in this analysis is one developed by Olsen and Tully (1970, 1971), however,

there is a slight modification. The Olsen and Tully model virtually divides the population into four distinct categories: high ascribed/high achieved; high ascribed/low achieved; low ascribed/high achieved; and low ascribed/low achieved individuals with the high/high and low/low categories being the status consistent individuals and the high/low and low/high categories the status inconsistent individuals. These four types of individuals are the result of a series of progressive two by two tables comparing an ascribed with an achieved status. However, this is where the modification appears in their model. Olsen and Tully only produce one such table comparing the combined ascribed statuses (a combination of race, nationality, religion and ethnic identification) with the combined achieved statuses (income, occupation and education). Instead of following this procedure, it will be far more fruitful to examine the individual combinations of statuses, therefore, reducing the risk of losing viable relationships through generalizations. For the purpose of this study, these inconsistent/consistent categories were arranged on a continuum with the consistent individuals at the midpoint and the two inconsistent individuals at either ends.

The data utilized in this analysis were derived from this author's previous study (Eby, 1971). The sample base consisted of 166 students from a large, eastern state university who were administered a 6-page questionnaire during selected class periods in September 1971 soon after the major campus disruptions of the previous Spring semester. This was not a random sample.

Five status variables were used in the analysis - income, education and occupation (the achieved statuses) and ethnicity and religion (the ascribed statuses). Income was based on the student's family income background, eg. the salary and wages (a regular income paid for services on a monthly or similar basis; also including commission) that are contributed to the family group by those members eligible to work - - in most cases this will be the father or mother or both. This was then dichotomized into high ($15,000 upward) and low (under $15,000).

Occupation was based on Edwards 7-point occupational prestige scale; and education, on Hollingshead's 7-point educational scale. In both cases, the achievement level of the student's father was ranked on these two scales. (Bonjean and Hill, 1967) Then, these too were dichotomized into high (occupations ranging in the high, medium or low executive categories and having at least some college, a college degree or higher) and low (occupations ranging in the clerical, skilled, semi-skilled or unskilled categories and having a high school diploma or less than twelve years of education).

Ethnicity was based on the father's ethnic background.[6] In this instance ethnicity refers to groups bound together by similar historic evolution, social organization and migration to the United States. (Braungart, 1970: 6) Students were ranked based on their father's ethnic origin on a continuum ranging from high to low ethnic status with the original "founding fathers" (Anglo-Saxon, Northern Europeans, etc.) having high status to "immigrants" (Eastern Europeans, Southern Europeans, etc.)

present day "minority groups" (Blacks, Asians, Mexican-Americans, etc.) having low status.

Finally, religion was based on the formal religious affiliation of the parents. It was classified into two status categories - high (Protestant and Catholic) and low (Jewish, other religions, and those stating that they were not affiliated with a religious organization) based on majority-minority membership and institutional dominance. (Braungart, 1970: 6)

In order to obtain a measure of the level of students' protest activity, students were assigned a score for their mobilization potential.[7] Operationally, this scale was devised through a series of questions tapping their actual and potential mobilization given situations of campus unrest. The scale was based on six categories or levels of mobilization ranging from letter-writing and petition signing to riot and rebellion. These categories were scaled as follows:

Type I - letter-writing, petition signing

Type II - picketing, boycotting

Type III - protest marching

Type IV - strike, walk-out

Type V - civil disobedience

Type VI - riot, rebellion

Students were assigned scores according to the highest positive response on these series of questions. The scores were then collapsed into the following threefold classification:

Passive Mobilization - Types I & II (N=47)

Active Mobilization - Types III & IV (N=52)

Hyperactive Mobilization - Types V & VI (N=57)

In all cases, the students achieved at least Type I level mobilization. This scale, too, was then arranged on a continuum based on the degree of mobilization with Hyperactive and Passive at the extremes and Active at the midpoint.

FINDINGS

The demographic characteristics of the sample were as follows: sex - approximately of equal proportion (males 47% and females 53%) with females being slightly more represented; age - at least three-fourths of the sample were over 20 (75%); class - over half the sample were juniors (53%) the others being equally distributed between sophmores and seniors; and GPA (Grade Point Average) 93% of the sample had B's (47%) and C's (46%), the other 7% had A's.

In examining the traditional bivariate method (See Tables 1-5) very weak relationships are shown. Thus, pointing to the apparent truth of Lipset's (1971: 33) statement that due to the growth of the student movement, the original relationship between the student's status background and his movement participation will have weakened considerably.

However, when this relationship is shown in terms of a multivariate analysis (in this instance using three variables - an ascribed

status versus an achieved status versus the level of mobilization) an entirely new dimension is added. As can be seen (See Tables 6-11) the relationships almost doubled. For example, when comparing ethnicity versus occupation, (Table 6) nearly half of the low ascribed/high achieved cell were hyperactive students (43%) while again in the high ascribed/low achieved cell 47% of that sample fell into the passive category thus conforming to the hypotheses. As well, the consistent cells also confirmed the suggested hypothesis. There was approximately 30-35% in each of the mobilization categories, thus indicating that probably other factors other than the student's status background were involved in the mobilization of these students. In all cases (with the exception of income and this probably was due to a methodological inadequacy of measurement or reporting), utilizing this typology of status types there is a 40-45% chance (varying slightly between the different variables) of predicting the student's level of mobilization in situations of campus unrest. These are the highest relationships thus far for any of the studies on student participation and status background.

DISCUSSION

Thus, the data confirmed the suggested hypotheses. The more actively mobilized students were drawn from the low ascribed/high achieved status backgrounds, and conversely the more passive or politically apathetic students were drawn from the high ascribed/low achieved status backgrounds.

These results almost parallel the results of the Olsen and Tully (1970) study and point to the significance of socioeconomic-ethnic status inconsistency as a strong predictor of mobilization potential in the student movement. Hence, these recent studies are inaccurate in their assumption that with the expanding growth of the student movement the role of status background has been greatly diminished if not removed.

Taking a look at these high ascribed/low achieved students it can be seen why they do adopt such a passive or non-existent role in campus unrest. These students are using higher education as a means of upward mobility. It is highly unlikely that they would jeopardize their opportunity for advancement by taking such risks as arrest or expulsion by participating in events of campus unrest. As Jackson (1962: 477) pointed out these individuals regard their deficiency in personal terms and do not see social change as a means of alleviating them. With their low degree of tolerance for protest actions, it is not surprising that these students do not participate or if they do it is by legitimate and sanctioned means.

Looking at these high ascribed/low achieved passive students in terms of the data, it can be seen that 43% are over 21; and 62% have an A - B average. In terms of politics and its saliency, 42% said that they considered politics important while 24% considered it unimportant while 3% of their parents considered politics unimportant. This just quantifies the above description of the passive student. Especially with the high grades, the passive student seems to spend his time and engery in attempting to better his position and not the social ills of society.

On the other hand the low ascribed/high achieved student provides a rather interesting case. He is not using higher education as a means of upward mobility for his parents are usually quite wealthy, well-educated and in the higher occupational positions. Flacks (1967a; 1967b: 55) sees these students (though here he was talking about the typical student activist, however, the description seems quite true of the low/high inconsistent as well as coming from - - -

> ". . . families instituting an upper-middle class humanistic subculture. Although these families occupy privileged positions in society, they differ from others in their strata and society as a whole, by their lack of commitment to traditional American values. Instead of being dedicated to occupational achievements with the consequent demand for rationality and self-control, they are imbued with a strong humanistic value orientation."

This value orientation manifests itself in a sincere concern for the welfare and social conditions of others, rather than in the more pragmatic concerns for self-education and improvement as characterized in the passive students. The family background of these low/high inconsistent students provides an excellent resource (through advanced education and a 'libertarian humanistic' family outlook) for the "social concern" perspective of these hyperactive students. This further enhances the assumption of Jackson (1962: 477) that these low/high inconsistent individuals favor strong political actions as a means of social change thereby bringing about a radical change in the values of others towards them.

Again looking at these low ascribed/high achieved hyperactive students in terms of the data it can be seen that 65% are under 21; 45% have B's while 55% have a C average; 42% consider themselves radicals;

65% often discuss politics with their friends and at home; 33% have attended lectures or meetings on political issues; 90% state that they would continue to participate in demonstrations; 52% consider politics very important while another 42% consider it important. For their parents the corresponding percentages are 29% (very important) and 58% (important). Also 51% of these students are Jewish which points to a well-suggested but little documented fact that it is in effect the affluent Jewish student who is in the forefront of the student movement.

To date there are practically no empirical studies specifically on the Jewish student and his role in campus unrest. In a study conducted in October 1971 (Drew, 1971: 47) of a nationwide sample of Jewish college freshmen, it was found that Jewish students tended to take a more progressive view than did other students from other religious backgrounds. However, this study failed to get at this question, though, of the Jewish student's role in campus unrest.

Mary and Kenneth Gergen (1971: 70) also in a nationwide sample of 5000 found that the demonstrators during the Cambodian invasion were disproportionately Jewish or of no church affiliation; and the Harris Survey (May 1970) found that 90% of the Jewish students at schools with demonstration protested as compared to 71% Protestants and 82% Catholics. These findings definitely suggest an urgent need to further study this phenomenon of the Jewish student and his role in campus unrest.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that this study can only be viewed as a case study. The findings really only unique to one particular large eastern state university. However, the findings are extremely suggestive and should not be ignored just on the basis of the sampling distribution. There is an indication of a modular pattern that hitherto seems to have been ignored in studies of the status backgrounds of participants in the student movement. Now what is needed is a randomized, multi-university study of students to determine the strength of socioeconomic-ethnic status inconsistency as a predictor of movement participation in situations of campus unrest.

Figure I

MODEL OF STATUS RELATIONSHIPS VERSUS
STUDENTS' POTENTIAL FOR MOBILIZATION

Status II (Ascribed) \ Status I (Achieved)	High	Low
High	Even Distribution Among All Types Of Mobilization	Passive Students
Low	Hyperactive Students	Even Distribution Among All Types Of Mobilization

Table 1

BIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF INCOME
VERSUS STUDENT'S POTENTIAL FOR MOBILIZATION

Family Income	Potential for Mobilization: Passive Students	Active Students	Hyperactive Students
Under $5,000	0.0% (0)	1.6% (1)	1.8% (1)
$5,000 - 7,500	0.0% (0)	1.6% (1)	5.3% (3)
$7,500 - 10,000	19.1% (9)	16.1% (10)	14.0% (8)
$10,000 - 15,000	31.9% (15)	25.8% (16)	21.1% (12)
$15,000 - 20,000	38.3% (18)	17.7% (11)	19.3% (11)
$20,000 - 35,000	8.5% (4)	30.6% (19)	29.8% (17)
$35,000 - 50,000+	2.1% (1)	6.5% (4)	8.8% (5)
	99.9% (47)	99.8% (62)	100.1% (57)

$X^2 = 19.44$ p = n.s.
gamma = .107

Table 2

BIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF OCCUPATION
VERSUS STUDENT'S POTENTIAL FOR MOBILIZATION

Occupation	Potential for Mobilization: Passive Students	Active Students	Hyperactive Students
Higher executive	27.7% (13)	21.0% (13)	31.6% (18)
Medium executive	17.0% (8)	37.1% (23)	29.8% (17)
Admin. personnel	23.4% (11)	21.0% (13)	24.6% (14)
Clerical	17.0% (8)	9.7% (6)	7.0% (4)
Skilled manual	12.8% (6)	8.1% (5)	7.0% (4)
Semi-skilled manual	2.1% (1)	1.6% (1)	0.0% (0)
Unskilled	0.0% (0)	1.6% (1)	0.0% (0)
	100.0% (47)	100.1% (62)	100.0% (57)

X^2 = 11.60 p = n.s.
gamma = -.157

Table 3

BIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF EDUCATION
VERSUS STUDENT'S POTENTIAL FOR MOBILIZATION

Education	Potential for Mobilization: Passive Students	Active Students	Hyperactive Students
Professional	17.0% (8)	19.4% (12)	21.1% (12)
Four-year college	14.9% (7)	17.7% (11)	31.6% (18)
One-three yr college	21.3% (10)	24.2% (15)	17.5% (10)
High school graduate	27.7% (13)	25.8% (16)	19.3% (11)
10 - 11 years school	6.4% (3)	6.5% (4)	5.3% (3)
7 - 9 years school	10.6% (5)	3.5% (4)	5.3% (3)
Under 7 years school	2.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
	100.0% (47)	100.1% (62)	100.1% (57)

$X^2 = 9.31$ p = n.s.
gamma = -.173

Table 4

BIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ETHNICITY
VERSUS STUDENT' POTENTIAL FOR MOBILIZATION

	Potential for Mobilization		
Ethnic Background	Passive Students	Active Students	Hyperactive Students
Great Britain	44.7% (21)	32.2% (20)	26.3% (15)
Northern Europe	2.1% (1)	3.2% (2)	3.5% (2)
Germany, France	25.5% (12)	21.0% (13)	10.5% (6)
Eastern Europe	12.8% (6)	32.2% (20)	45.6% (26)
Southern Europe	6.4% (3)	9.7% (6)	8.8% (5)
Blacks	6.4% (3)	0.0% (0)	3.5% (2)
Arabs	0.0% (0)	1.6% (1)	0.0% (0)
Asians	2.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.8% (1)
	100.0% (47)	100.1% (62)	100.0% (57)

$\chi^2 = 22.08$ $p < .10 > .05$
gamma = .222

Table 5

BIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF RELIGION
VERSUS STUDENT'S POTENTIAL FOR MOBILIZATION

	Potential for Mobilization		
Family Religion	Passive Students	Active Students	Hyperactive Students
Protestant	40.4% (19)	33.9% (21)	22.8% (13)
Catholic	40.4% (19)	30.7% (19)	31.6% (18)
Jewish	8.5% (4)	33.9% (21)	42.1% (24)
Other Religions	8.5% (4)	1.6% (1)	1.8% (1)
Agnostic, Atheist	2.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.8% (1)
	99.6% (47)	100.1% (62)	100.1% (57)

$X^2 = 19.72$ $p < .02 > .01$
gamma = .238

Table 6

SOCIOECONOMIC-ETHNIC STATUS INCONSISTENCY
VERSUS LEVELS OF MOBILIZATION

(Ethnicity vs. Occupation)

Levels of Mobilization	Type of Status Configuration		
	Low/High Status Inconsistents	Status Consistents	High/Low Status Inconsistents
Hyperactive	49.1% (27)	30.9% (29)	5.9% (1)
Active	40.0% (22)	34.0% (32)	47.1% (8)
Passive	10.9% (6)	35.1% (33)	47.1% (8)
	100.0% (55)	100.0% (94)	100.1% (17)

$X^2 = 22.14$ $p < .001$
gamma = .4599

Table 7

SOCIOECONOMIC-ETHNIC STATUS INCONSISTENCY
VERSUS LEVELS OF MOBILIZATION

(Religion vs. Occupation)

Levels of Mobilization	Type of Status Configuration		
	Low/High Status Inconsistents	Status Consistents	High/Low Status Inconsistents
Hyperactive	46.3% (19)	35.2% (37)	5.0% (1)
Active	43.9% (18)	33.3% (35)	45.0% (9)
Passive	9.8% (4)	31.4% (33)	50.0% (10)
	100.0% (41)	99.9% (105)	100.0% (20)

$X^2 = 20.59 \quad p < .001$
gamma = .4330

Table 8

SOCIOECONOMIC-ETHNIC STATUS INCONSISTENCY
VERSUS LEVELS OF MOBILIZATION

(Ethnicity vs. Education)

Levels of Mobilization	Type of Status Configuration		
	Low/High Status Inconsistents	Status Consistents	High/Low Status Inconsistents
Hyperactive	53.9% (21)	32.3% (32)	14.3% (4)
Active	33.3% (13)	39.4% (39)	35.7% (10)
Passive	2.8% (5)	28.3% (28)	50.0% (14)
	100.0% (39)	100.0% (99)	100.0% (28)

$X^2 = 20.21$ $p < .001$
gamma = .4470

Table 9

SOCIOECONOMIC-ETHNIC STATUS INCONSISTENCY
VERSUS LEVELS OF MOBILIZATION

(Religion vs. Education)

Level of Mobilization	Type of Status Configuration		
	Low/High Status Inconsistents	Status Consistents	High/Low Status Inconsistents
Hyperactive	50.0% (14)	36.5% (38)	14.7% (5)
Active	39.3% (11)	36.5% (38)	38.2% (13)
Passive	10.7% (3)	26.9% (28)	47.1% (16)
	100.0% (28)	99.9% (104)	100.0% (34)

$X^2 = 17.38 \quad p < .01 > .001$
gamma = .4172

Table 10

SOCIOECONOMIC-ETHNIC STATUS INCONSISTENCY
VERSUS LEVELS OF MOBILIZATION

(Ethnicity vs. Income)

Level of Mobilization	Type of Status Configuration		
	Low/High Status Inconsistents	Status Consistents	High/Low Status Inconsistents
Hyperactive	43.6% (17)	38.4% (33)	17.1% (7)
Active	38.5% (15)	36.0% (31)	39.0% (16)
Passive	18.0% (7)	25.6% (22)	43.9% (18)
	100.1% (39)	100.0% (86)	100.0% (41)

$x^2 = 14.38$ $p < .01 > .001$
gamma = .1985

Table 11

SOCIOECONOMIC-ETHNIC STATUS INCONSISTENCY
VERSUS LEVELS OF MOBILIZATION

(Religion vs. Income)

Level of Mobilization	Type of Status Configuration: Low/High Status Inconsistents	Status Consistents	High/Low Status Inconsistents
Hyperactive	46.4% (13)	36.3% (33)	23.4% (11)
Active	46.4% (13)	33.0% (30)	40.4% (19)
Passive	7.1% (2)	30.8% (28)	36.2% (17)
	99.9% (28)	100.1% (91)	100.0% (47)

$X^2 = 12.69$ $p > .02 < .01$
gamma = .2903

FOOTNOTES

*The data analysis for this paper was achieved through a grant from the Computer Science Center, The University of Maryland.

[1]The student movement refers to a large group of people, most of them under thirty, who are currently students or who identify themselves with the concept of a university community and see it as a legitimate focus for societal change. Thus the movement includes not only matriculated students but former students and persons who find the university milieu most congenial. Gary B. Weaver, "Introduction," The University and Revolution, Gary B. Weaver and James H. Weaver (eds.), Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969, pp. 1.

[2]The results were even higher for students' potential towards participation in order to express disapproval of government policy. For example: in 1966, 74.8% indicated that they would sign a petition, but in 1970 it had risen to 81.6%. In 1966, 5.4% indicated that they would allow themselves to be arrested while demonstrating, however, in 1970 it had risen to 13.0%. Students indicating that they would engage in violent protests had changed from 1.1% in 1966 to 4.5% in 1970. Even more startling was the result that 0.5% of the students in 1966 indicated that they would sacrifice their own life in order to express disapproval but in 1970 this has risen to 1.7% (in fact in 1970, 0.4% had indicated that they had actually attempted to give their life in protest). See Tables 3 and 4 (Yankelovich, 1971: 11-12)

[3]Those interested in the development of this field should see: Blalock (1966, 1967); Geschwender (1964, 1967, 1968); Goffman (1957); Jackson (1962, 1965); Kelly and Chambliss (1966); Kengle (1956); Lenski (1954, 1956, 1964, 1967); Mitchell (1964); Rush (1967); Segal (1967, 1969); Segal and Knoke (1968, 1969); Smith (1969); Treiman (1966); and Wiley (1967).

[4]Smith (1969) found exception to this generalization, for he found that inconsistencies among occupational, educational and income statuses (achieved statuses) did produce Democratic preference among persons aged under 45. However, the significance was extremely slight.

[5]See Table 1 "Comparison of Veteran and Non-Veteran Cadre and Student Cross-Section on Selected Variables Relevant to Student Activism" pp. 59.

[6]The ethnic background was categorized into eight geographic areas: Britain - England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales; Northern Europe - Scandinavia, Holland, Belgium and Switzerland; Germany and France; Eastern Europe - Russia,

Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, and other Slavic countries; Southern Europe - Italy Greece, Spain, Portugal; American Blacks, African, West Indies; Arabs - Egypt, Israel, Jorden, Lebanon; and Asia - Japan, Korea, and Nationalist China

[7]There were three other possible typologies of student mobilization: Clark Kerr, "Student Dissent and Confrontation Politics," Protest: Student Activism in America, Julian Foster and Durward Long (eds.), New York: William Morrow & Co., 1970, pp. 3-10; Kenneth Keniston, "The Sources of Student Dissent," Journal of Social Issues, 23(1967) ff. 5; and Durward Long and Julian Foster, "Levels of Protest," Protest: Student Activism in America, Julian Foster and Durward Long (eds.), New York: William Morrow & Co., 1970, pp. 89-105. However, as they were so very difficult to operationally utilize, it became necessary to devise one.

REFERENCES

Bonjean, Charles M. and Richard J. Hill
1967 Sociological Measurement: An Inventory of Scales and Indices, San Francisco, California: Chandler Publishing Company.

Brandmeyer, Gerard
1965 "Status Consistency and Political Behavior: A Replication and Extension of Research," Sociological Quarterly, 6(July) 241-256.

Braungart, Richard G.
1970 "Status Politics and Student Politics: An Analysis of Left and Right Wing Student Activists," paper presented at the 3rd Annual Research Institute of the District of Columbia Sociological Society, College Park, Maryland, May.

Broom, Leonard and F. Lancaster Jones
1970 "Status Consistency and Political Preference: The Australian Case," American Sociological Review, 35(December) 989-1001.

Derber, Charles and Richard Flacks
1967 "An Exploration of the Value System of Radical Student Activists and their Parents," paper presented at the 62nd Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, August - September.

Drew, David E.
1971 "Jewish Students Today: Radical or Conservative?" Trans-action, 8(October) 45-48.

Dunlap, Riley
1970 "Radical and Conservative Student Activists: A Comparison of Family Background," Pacific Sociological Review, 13(Summer) 171-181.

Eby, Maureen A.
1971 "Status Politics vis-a-vis Students' Potential for Mobilization: Its Validity in the 70's," paper presented at the 4th Annual Research Institute of the District of Columbia Sociological Society, Washington, D.C., May.

Flacks, Richard
1967a "Student Activists: Results, Not Revolt," Psychology Today, 1(October) 18-23.

1967b "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest," Journal of Social Issues, 23(July) 52-75.

1970 "Who Protests: The Social Bases of the Student Movement," Protest: Student Activism in America, Julian Foster and Durward Long, (eds.), New York: William Morrow & Co., 134-157.

Gergen, Mary K. and Kenneth J. Gergen
1971 "How the War Affects the Campuses," Change, 3(January-February).

Goffman, Irving W.
1957 "Status Consistency and Preference for Change in Power Distribution" American Sociological Review, 22(June) 275-281.

Harris Poll
1970 Report of the Harris Survey of Students, May 20-28.

Jackson, Elton F.
1962 "Status Inconsistency and Symptoms of Stress," American Sociological Review, 27(August) 469-480.

Kahn, R.M. and William J. Bowers
1970 "The Social Context of the Rank-and-File Student Activist: A Test of Four Hypotheses," Sociology of Education, 43(Winter) 38-55.

Kelly, K. Dennis and William Chambliss
1966 "Status Consistency and Political Attitudes," American Sociological Review, 31(June) 375-382.

Kruschke, Earl R.
1971 "On the Matter of Law-Abidingness Among Liberal And Conservative Students," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, September.

Laumann, Edward O and David R. Segal
1971 "Status Inconsistency and Ethnoreligious Group Membership as Determinants of Social Participation and Political Attitudes," American Journal of Sociology, 77(July) 36-61.

Lenski, Gerhard
1954 "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status," American Sociological Review, 19(August) 405-413.

1967 "Status Inconsistency and the Vote: A Four Nation Test," American Sociological Review, 32(April) 298-301.

Lipset, Seymour Martin
1971 Rebellion in the University, Boston, Massachusetts: Little, Brown and Company.

Mankoff, Milton and Richard Flacks
1971 "The Changing Social Base of the American Student Movement." The Annals, 395(May) 54-67.

Mitchell, Robert Edward
1964 "Methodological Notes on a Theory of Status Crystallization," Public Opinion Quarterly, 28(Summer) 315-325.

Olsen, Marvin E. and Judy C. Tully
1970 "Socioeconomic-ethnic Status Inconsistency and Preference for Political Change," Working Paper No. 102 of the Institute of Social Research, Indiana University.

1971 "Socioeconomic-ethnic Status Inconsistency and Preference for Political Change," (revision) unpublished mimeographed paper, Indiana University.

Rush, Gary B.
1967 "Status Consistency and Right Wing Extremism," American Sociological Review, 32(February) 86-92.

Segal, David R.
1969 "Status Inconsistency, Cross Pressures and American Political Behavior," American Sociological Review, 34(June) 352-358.

1970 "Status Inconsistency and Party Choice in Canada: An Attempt to Replicate," Canadian Journal of Political Science, 3(September) 471-474.

Segal, David R. and David Knoke
1968 "Social Mobility, Status Inconsistency and Partisan Realignment in the United States," Social Forces, 47(December) 154-157.

1969 "Class Inconsistency, Status Inconsistency, and Political Partisanship in America," Working Paper No. 48 of the Center for Research on Social Organization, University of Michigan.

1971 "Class Inconsistency, Status Inconsistency, and Political Partisanship in America," The Journal of Politics, 33(Autumn) 941-954.

Smith, Thomas J.
1969 "Structural Crystallization, Status Inconsistency, and Political Partisanship," American Sociological Review, 34(December) 907-921.

Treiman, Donald J.
1966 "Status Discrepancy and Prejudice," American Journal of Sociology, 71(May) 651-664.

Tygart, Clarence and Norman Holt
1971 "A Research Note on Student Leftist Political Activism and Family Socio-economic Status," Pacific Sociological Review, 14(January) 121-128.